

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9, amended claims 1, 4, and 7, and new claims 10-12 are in this application.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,918,205 to Dierke.

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"a judging unit operable to judge: (i) whether said received data conforms to a predetermined standard, and (ii) whether said encrypted data has been properly decoded; and

an output stop unit operable to stop the supply of output data from said decoder to a later processing device when said judging unit determines if any one of the following two items exists: (i) said received data does not conform to said predetermined standard, and (ii) said encrypted data has not been properly decoded." (Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserted that audio core module 14 illustrated in Figure 2 along with lines 39-45 of column 3 of Dierke and gate 20 illustrated in Figure 3 along with lines 43-51 of column 1, lines 43-45 of column 3, and lines 6-13 of column 4 respectively disclose the judging unit and the output stop unit of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Dierke do not disclose the judging unit and the output stop unit of claim 1 for at least the reasons herein below described.

First, the judging unit of claim 1 may be operable to judge "whether said received data conforms to a predetermined standard." As indicated in the present application, examples of such "predetermined standard" may include the IEC60958 standard or the MPEG standard. Although the portion of Dierke relied on by the Examiner to disclose the judging unit (i.e., lines 39-45

of column 3 thereof) mentions "error flags," such portion of Dierke does not appear to disclose judging whether received data "conforms to a predetermined standard" such as the IEC60958 standard or the MPEG standard.

Second, the output stop unit of claim 1 may be operable to stop the supply of output data from a decoder to a later processing device when the judging unit determines that "said received data does not conform to said predetermined standard." The portions of Dierke relied on by the Examiner to disclose the output stop unit (i.e., lines 43-51 of column 1, lines 43-45 of column 3, and lines 6-13 of column 4 thereof) do not appear to specifically disclose stopping the supply of data when received data does not conform to a "predetermined standard" such as the IEC60958 standard or the MPEG standard.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Dierke as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 4 and 7 are distinguishable from Dierke as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9, and new claims 10-12 are dependent from one of independent claims 1, 4, and 7. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8-12 are distinguishable from Dierke as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at

Application No.: 09/976,476

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-210

(908) 518-6374 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any charges required in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid
Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

579609_1.DOC